arXiv:1404.3906v3 [math.CO] 2 Jun 2015

On the 2-Abelian Complexity of the Thue–Morse Word

Florian Greinecker
greinecker@math.tugraz.at
Department of Analysis and Computational Number Theory (Math A), Steyrergasse 30, 8010 Graz, Austria

June 3, 2015

Abstract

We show that the 2-abelian complexity of the infinite Thue–Morse word is 2-regular, and other properties of the 2-abelian complexity, most notably that it is a concatenation of palindromes of increasing length. We also show sharp bounds for the length of unique extensions of factors of size n, occurring in the Thue–Morse word.

Keywords: Thue–Morse word, complexity of infinite words, 2-abelian complexity, 2-regular sequence
MSC2010: 11B85, 68Q70, 68R15

1 Introduction

This paper contributes to the study of the Thue-Morse word. The infinite Thue–Morse word $t = 01101001100101101001011\cdots$ is defined as

$$t := \lim_{n\to\infty} m^n(0)$$

where m is the morphism

$$m\colon 0 \mapsto 01, 1 \mapsto 10.$$

The set of all finite factors of the Thue–Morse word will be denoted by T, while T_n stands for the set of Thue–Morse factors of length n.

In this paper we will prove three theorems about t. The first one is about extensions of factors of t . If we want to prolongate a factor of t to a longer factor of t there is sometimes only one possible letter. For example after 00 the next letter has to be a 1. We will give upper and lower bounds for the length of such extensions in Theorem 3.4.

Then we take a look at the 2-abelian complexity sequence of the Thue–Morse word. We will prove that it is a concatenation of palindromes of increasing length (Theorem 7.3) and secondly the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1. *The 2-abelian complexity of the Thue–Morse word t is 2-regular.*

To understand this theorem let us take a look at the first concept in Theorem 1.1: the ℓ-abelian complexity.

The ℓ-abelian complexity is a complexity measure, which was first introduced in 1981 by Karhumäki [6]. The ℓ-abelian complexity $\mathcal{P}_w^{(\ell)}(n)$ of an infinite word w builds a bridge between the abelian complexity which corresponds to $\ell = 1$ and the factor complexity which corresponds to $\ell = +\infty$ and allows a finer resolution. The abelian complexity $\mathcal{P}_w^{(1)}(n)$ of an infinite word counts the anagrams of length n while the factor complexity $\mathcal{P}_w^{(\infty)}(n)$ counts the factors in T_n. The abelian complexity sequence of the infinite Thue–Morse word is $(\mathcal{P}_t^{(1)}(n))_{n\geq 0} = 1, (2,3)^\omega$. The factor complexity [4] of the Thue–Morse word t is well known

$$\mathcal{P}_t^{(\infty)}(0) = 1, \quad \mathcal{P}_t^{(\infty)}(1) = 2, \quad \mathcal{P}_t^{(\infty)}(2) = 4,$$

$$\mathcal{P}_t^{(\infty)}(n) = \begin{cases} 4n - 2\cdot 2^m - 4, & \text{if } 2\cdot 2^m < n \leq 3\cdot 2^m; \\ 2n + 4\cdot 2^m - 2, & \text{if } 3\cdot 2^m < n \leq 4\cdot 2^m. \end{cases}$$

Before we define ℓ-abelian complexity we need some vocabulary. For a word $w = w_0 w_1 \cdots w_n$ the prefix of length ℓ is defined as $\mathrm{pref}_\ell(w) := w_0 \cdots w_{\ell-1}$ while the suffix of length ℓ is $\mathrm{suff}_\ell(w) := w_{n-\ell+1} \cdots w_n$.

We write $|w|$ to denote the *length* of a word w. If v is a factor of w the number of occurrences of v in w is denoted by $|w|_v$. We write $\mathbb{N}_0$ for the natural numbers, including 0.

Definition 1.2. *For an integer $\ell \geq 1$, two words $u, v \in A^*$, for some alphabet A, are* ℓ-abelian equivalent *if*

1. $\mathrm{pref}_{\ell-1}(u) = \mathrm{pref}_{\ell-1}(v)$ *and* $\mathrm{suff}_{\ell-1}(u) = \mathrm{suff}_{\ell-1}(v)$, *and*
2. *for all $w \in A^*$ with $|w| = \ell$ the number of occurrences of w in u and v is equal, i.e. $|u|_w = |v|_w$.*

We then write $u \equiv_\ell v$.

There are several equivalent definitions of ℓ-abelian equivalence (cf. [7]), we use the one from [11]. Note that the given definition is not minimal, it would suffice to use either $\mathrm{pref}_{\ell-1}(v)$ or $\mathrm{suff}_{\ell-1}(v)$.

It is easy to check that ℓ-abelian equivalence is indeed an equivalence relation. The first part of the definition, where we fix the prefix and suffix, guarantees that two ℓ-abelian equivalent words are also $(\ell-1)$-abelian equivalent.

Example 1.3. *Let us take two words $w = 001011$ and $v = 001101$. We see that $w \equiv_2 v$ since $|w|_{00} = 1$, $|w|_{01} = 2$, $|w|_{10} = 1$, $|w|_{11} = 1$ and we get the same values for v. Furthermore both words have the same prefix and suffix. On the other hand $w \not\equiv_3 v$ since $|001011|_{010} = 1$ and $|001101|_{010} = 0$. Also the suffixes differ, $11 \neq 01$.*

Since $\equiv_\ell$ is an equivalence relation it is natural to count equivalence classes.

We are interested in the number of 2-abelian equivalence classes for words of a given length:

$$\mathcal{P}_t^{(2)}(n) := \#(T_n/_{\equiv_2}).$$

Usually we write $\mathcal{P}_w^{(\ell)}(n)$ to denote the number of ℓ-abelian equivalence classes of factors of w of length n, where w is an infinite word. In rest of this paper, we will only consider the 2-abelian complexity of the Thue–Morse word t. Therefore we will use the simpler notation $\mathcal{P}_n := \mathcal{P}_t^{(2)}(n)$.

The sequence starts with

$$(\mathcal{P}_n)_{n\geq 0} = 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 6, 8, 10, 8, 6, 8, 8, 10, 10, 10, 8, 8, 6, 8, 10, 10, 8, 10, 12, 12,$$
$$10, 12, 12, 10, 8, 10, 10, 8, 6, 8, 8, 10, 10, 12, 12, 10, 8, 10, 12, 14, 12, 12, 12, 12, \ldots.$$

Definition 1.4. *We assign to every word w its equivalence class. To denote the 2-abelian equivalence class of a word w we use a 6-tuple.*

$$\text{class}\colon T \to \mathbb{N}_0^4 \times \{0,1\}^2, \;\; w \mapsto (|w|_{00}, |w|_{01}, |w|_{10}, |w|_{11}, w_0, w_n).$$

Example 1.5. *We have* $\text{class}(w) = (1, 2, 3, 1, 1, 0)$ *for* $w = 10011010$.

Karhumäki, Saarela and Zamboni showed in [8] that for $n \geq 1$, $m \geq 0$ we have

$$\mathcal{P}_t^{(2)}(n) = O(\log n), \quad \mathcal{P}_t^{(2)}((2 \cdot 4^m + 4)/3) = \Theta(m) \quad \text{and } \mathcal{P}_t^{(2)}(2^m + 1) \leq 8.$$

Actually, $\mathcal{P}_t^{(2)}(2^m + 1) = 6$, for $m \geq 1$.

Theorem 1.1 combines two concepts: ℓ-abelian complexity and k-regular sequences. We just treated ℓ-abelian complexity, let us now look at k-regular sequences.

Allouche and Shallit introduced k-regular sequences in 1990 [1]. It is a well-known theorem by Eilenberg [5] that a sequence is k-automatic if and only if its k-kernel is finite.

Definition 1.6. *Let $k \geq 2$ be an integer. The* k-kernel *of a sequence $(a(n))_{n\geq 0}$ is the set of subsequences*

$$\{(a(k^e n + c))_{n\geq 0} \mid e \geq 0, \;\; 0 \leq c < k^e\}.$$

For example, the Thue-Morse sequence is 2-automatic. Allouche and Shallit [1] took this characterization of k-automatic sequences via the kernel and extended it to k-regular sequences.

Definition 1.7 (Allouche and Shallit)**.** *Let $k \geq 2$ be an integer. An integer sequence $(a(n))_{n\geq 0}$ is* k-regular *if the $\mathbb{Z}$-module generated by its k-kernel is finitely generated.*

Just recently research begun to investigate the regularity of the abelian complexity. Madill and Rampersad showed that the abelian complexity of the paperfolding word is 2-regular [9].

This article solves an open conjecture from Elise Vandomme, Aline Parreau and Michel Rigo [11] who conjectured that the 2-abelian complexity of the infinite Thue–Morse word is 2-regular. This is a special case of a more general conjecture by Rigo.

Conjecture 1.8. *The 2-abelian complexity of any k-automatic word is an k-regular sequence.*

Shortly after the discovery of our proof, they found an independent proof [10] of their own, which uses the palindromic structure of the sequence.

This paper is organized as follows:

After some definitions in the rest of this section we will introduce *reading frames* in Section 2. Reading frames are a factorization of words into factors v_i of the form $v_i = m^q(0)$ or $v_i = m^q(1)$ for some $q \in \mathbb{N}$, plus a prefix and suffix of shorter length. Reading frames are a natural way to think about the Thue–Morse word since they preserve the morphism structure.

We use these reading frames in Section 3 to prove Theorem 3.4 about unique extensions of Thue–Morse factors. For a factor w in t there is sometimes only one possibility for the next (or previous) letters $x_1 \cdots x_n$ so that $wx_1 \cdots x_n$ (or $x_1 \cdots x_n w$) is again a factor of t. We give lower and upper bounds for the lengths of such unique extensions. Section 3 can be skipped if one is only interested in the proof of the 2-regularity.

In Definition 1.4 we needed 6 values to describe the 2-abelian equivalence class of a factor w, 4 binary values and 2 integer values. We introduce the *odd frame* in Section 4 in order to simplify this 6-tuple of values. The odd frame is a shifted reading frame, which does not preserve the morphism structure but allows to use only 3 values to represent the 2-abelian equivalence class of a factor w with 2 binary values and 1 integer value. Only the possible values of the integer $p(w)$, the possible numbers of pairs in a factor w, are nontrivial to determine.

Beside the odd frame we also introduce a *short coding*. The short coding is a way to encode words in the odd frame so that the numbers of pairs in a factor w can be seen on the first view.

In Section 5 we use the properties of pure odd words to prove a recursion (Theorem 5.2) on two types of sets, where $\mathbf{pairs}(n)$ is the set of all possible values of $p(w)$ for factors w of length n. Once we have the recursion we can use it to determine $\mathcal{P}_t^{(2)}(n)$ for all n (Theorem 5.4). These two theorems are used in all further proofs.

Equipped with Theorem 5.2 and Lemma 5.4 we prove the main Theorem 1.1 in Section 6 by showing 13 linear relations given in Theorem 1.1.*. For each of the 13 relations the calculations are similar but, since we have to look at three cases for each of them, a bit lengthy.

Finally we show some additional properties of $\mathcal{P}_t^{(2)}(n)$ in Section 7, most notably that $\mathcal{P}_t^{(2)}(n)$ is a concatenation of longer and longer palindromes. Again we use Theorem 5.2 and Theorem 5.4 to do this. We also show that $\mathcal{P}_t^{(2)}(n)$ is unbounded.

Before we continue with the proof we will need some definitions. We will use the fact that t is overlap-free (cf. [2], Theorem 1.6.1). An *overlap* is a word of the form $xwxwx$, where w is a word, possibly empty, and x is a single letter. The word t is also cubefree, i.e. it contains no word of the form www where w is a nonempty factor.

The Thue–Morse word is defined over the binary alphabet $A = \{0, 1\}$. A (literal) *pattern* is a word over the alphabet $E = \{\alpha, \beta\}$. Furthermore we define the involutive morphisms $\overline{0} := 1$ and $\overline{1} := 0$ and similarly $\overline{\alpha} := \beta$ and $\overline{\beta} := \alpha$. If w is the word $w = x_1 x_2 \dots x_n$ we call the word $\overline{w} := \overline{x}_1 \overline{x}_2 \dots \overline{x}_n$ the *complement* of w. An *assignment* of a pattern is the image of a pattern under a bijective function from E to A. A pattern p and a word w are *equal* ($p = w$) if $p = w$

for one assignment of p. We introduce patterns to avoid case distinctions for complementary words.

Example 1.9. *The pattern* $\alpha\overline{\alpha}\alpha\overline{\alpha}\overline{\alpha}$ *can stand for* 01011 *or* 10100 *depending on the assignment of* α*. So does* $\overline{\alpha}\alpha\overline{\alpha}\alpha\alpha$*.*

If we want a pattern out of a word, we do this via the morphism

$$\mathrm{pat}\colon 0 \mapsto \alpha,\ 1 \mapsto \overline{\alpha}.$$

From now on we will just write *word* if we mean a finite factor of t.

2 Reading frames

From its definition via the morphism m it is clear that the Thue–Morse word is composed of copies of its first 2^q letters, $q \in \mathbb{N}$, and their complements. To denote the special role of these words we define $f_{2^q} := t_0 t_1 \cdots t_{2^q-1}$.

Example 2.1. *We take* $q = 2$ *and get* $\mathrm{pat}(f_{2^2}) = \alpha\overline{\alpha\alpha}\alpha$ *which gives us*

$$t = 01101001100101101001011\cdots = \underline{\vert 0110\vert 1001\vert}\,\underline{1001\vert 0110\vert}\,\underline{1001\vert}011\cdots$$

A property that will be useful later is that the word f_{2^q} has the image $m(f_{2^q}) = f_{2^{q+1}}$ and the preimage $m^{-1}(f_{2^q}) = f_{2^{q-1}}$.

Definition 2.2. *A* 2^q-reading frame *of a word* $w \in T$ *is a factorization of* w *into words* $w = pv_1 \cdots v_m s$*, where* $v_1, \cdots, v_m$ *are words of length* 2^q *plus a prefix* p *and a suffix* s *with* $|p|, |s| < 2^q$*, so that* v_i *is a word with* $v_i = \mathrm{pat}(f_{2^q})$*, for the prefix* p *we have* $p = \mathrm{pat}(\mathrm{suff}_{|p|}(f_{2^q}))$ *and for the suffix* s *we have accordingly* $s = \mathrm{pat}(\mathrm{pref}_{|s|}(f_{2^q}))$*.*

We call p, s and the v_i *frame words*, especially the v_i are called *complete frame words*. The 1-reading frame is called the *trivial frame*. A word $w \in T$ may have several different 2^q-reading frames but at most 2^q. If we shift a 2^q-reading frame one letter to the right we are in a new reading frame and after 2^q shifts we are in the original reading frame again. If there is only one 2^q-reading frame it is called the *extensible* reading frame.

We said in the beginning of this section that t is composed of copies of its first 2^q letters and their complements. So the infinite Thue–Morse word t has a 2^q-reading frame for every q. Since any word w in T is a factor of t it can be read in the same reading frame as t. And if w has only one 2^q-reading frame it has to be the 2^q-reading frame of t.

We can can get the previous and next letters of t if we fill up prefix and suffix to complete frame words in the 2^q-reading frame. We will use a *gray* font for filled up letters. Since t is infinite the extensible 2^q-reading frame of w can be extended to arbitrary length (possibly in different ways) but the filled up letters are unambiguous. So if the filled up letters in the prefix and suffix give a word which is not in T we can not be in the extensible reading frame.

If there is an extensible 2^q-reading frame, we call the 2^{q-1}-reading frame that we get by splitting every complete 2^q-reading frame word into two complete 2^{q-1}-reading frame words, extensible too.

Example 2.3. *The word* 0101 *has two* 2*-reading frames:* $\lfloor\underline{01}\rfloor\lfloor\underline{01}\rfloor$ *and* $\underline{0}\lfloor\underline{10}\rfloor\underline{1}$*, but the extensible* 2*-reading frame is* $\lfloor\underline{01}\rfloor\lfloor\underline{01}\rfloor$*. We can not extend the* $\underline{0}\lfloor\underline{10}\rfloor\underline{1}$ *reading frame since if we fill up the letters we get* $\lfloor 10\rfloor\lfloor\underline{10}\rfloor\lfloor 10\rfloor$*, but* t *is cubefree.*

And 0101 *has a unique* 4*-reading frame:* $\underline{01}\lfloor\underline{01}\rfloor$*. We can get the* 4*-reading frame by merging two* 2*-reading frame words. Since every complete* 4*-reading frame word has the pattern* $\alpha\overline{\alpha}\alpha\alpha$ *it can not be* $\lfloor\underline{0101}\rfloor$ *so the extensible* 4*-reading frame is* $\lfloor 10\underline{01}\rfloor\lfloor\underline{01}10\rfloor$*. Thus* 0101 *is extensible.*

Let us state some of the previous comments explicitly as lemma.

Lemma 2.4. *A word* $w \in T$ *has a* 2^q*-reading frame for every* $q \in \mathbb{N}_0$*.*

Proof. By definition w occurs somewhere in t. But t can be read in a 2^q-reading frame for every q therefore w can be read in a 2^q-reading frame too. □

Corollary 2.5. *A word* w *is not in* T *if there exists an integer* q*, so that* w *has no* 2^q*-reading frame.*

Example 2.6. *The words assigned to the patterns* $\alpha\alpha\alpha$*,* $\alpha\alpha\overline{\alpha}\alpha\alpha$ *and* $\alpha\overline{\alpha}\alpha\overline{\alpha}\alpha$ *are not in* T *since* t *is overlap-free. We can also prove this with reading frames. The the words assigned to the patterns* $\alpha\alpha\alpha$ *and* $\alpha\alpha\overline{\alpha}\alpha\alpha$ *are not in* T *since they have no* 2*-reading frame. The the words assigned to the pattern* $\alpha\overline{\alpha}\alpha\overline{\alpha}\alpha$ *are not in* T *since they have no* 4*-reading frame.*

3 Maximal extensible reading frames

An *extension* of a word $w \in T$ is a pair of words (v_1, v_2) with $v_1, v_2 \in T$, $|v_1| + |v_2| > 0$ so that $v_1 w v_2 \in T$. An extension (v_1, v_2) is *unique* if for all pairs $(y_1, y_2) \in \{0,1\}^* \times \{0,1\}^*$ with $|v_1| = |y_1|, |v_2| = |y_2|$ and $(v_1, v_2) \neq (y_1, y_2)$ it follows $y_1 w y_2 \notin T$.

We already saw that we can get unique extensions of a word $w \in T$ if we fill up prefix and suffix to complete frame words in the extensible reading frame. In this section we will prove that we get all unique extensions of a word $w \in T$ by filling up prefix and suffix in a certain 2^q-reading frame.

There is a *maximal extensible reading frame* (abbreviated as MERF), since if w is a factor of f_{2^q} it can not uniquely determine a 2^{q+1}-reading frame.

Example 3.1. *The word* $w = 011$ *has the extensible* 2*-reading frame* $\lfloor\underline{01}\rfloor\lfloor\underline{1}0\rfloor$*. The* 2*-reading frame is the MERF since there are two possible* 4*-reading frames;* w *is a factor of* $\lfloor\underline{0110}\rfloor$ *and* w *is also a factor of* $\lfloor\underline{1001}\rfloor\lfloor\underline{1001}\rfloor$*.*

For small cases it is easy to determine the maximal extensible reading frame by hand, while longer words can be reduced to the short cases as preimages under the morphism m.

The extensible reading frame of a factor v of w also determines the extensible reading frame of w. Therefore every word in T of length at least 4 has an extensible 2-reading frame. We can now formulate an algorithm to determine the MERF of a word w.

The algorithm determines the extensible 2-reading frame of the word and fills up the prefix and the suffix of w to complete frame words, then takes the preimage of the new word and repeats those steps till it reaches a word with

Pattern	MERF
$\underline{\lfloor\alpha\rfloor}$	1-reading frame
$\underline{\alpha\rfloor\lfloor\alpha}$	2-reading frame
$\underline{\lfloor\alpha\rfloor\lfloor\overline{\alpha}\rfloor}$	1-reading frame
$\underline{\alpha\rfloor\lfloor\alpha\overline{\alpha}\rfloor}$	2-reading frame
$\underline{\lfloor\alpha\rfloor\lfloor\overline{\alpha}\rfloor\lfloor\alpha\rfloor}$	1-reading frame
$\underline{\lfloor\alpha\overline{\alpha}\rfloor\lfloor\overline{\alpha}}$	2-reading frame

Pattern	MERF
$\underline{\alpha\alpha\overline{\alpha}\rfloor\lfloor\alpha}$	4-reading frame
$\underline{\alpha\rfloor\lfloor\alpha\overline{\alpha}\rfloor\lfloor\overline{\alpha}}$	2-reading frame
$\underline{\alpha\rfloor\lfloor\overline{\alpha}\alpha\alpha}$	4-reading frame
$\underline{\alpha\overline{\alpha}\rfloor\lfloor\alpha\overline{\alpha}}$	4-reading frame
$\underline{\lfloor\alpha\overline{\alpha}\rfloor\lfloor\overline{\alpha}\alpha\rfloor}$	2-reading frame

Table 1: MERFs for all nonempty words in T up to length 4.

no extensible 2-reading frame. In every step the reading frame size doubles and the algorithm will need q steps if the MERF has size 2^q.

In every step there will be at most two new letters before the word size is halved. So the words will get shorter in every step until they have a length of 4 or shorter. Since the algorithm terminates for all words in Table 1 it will terminate in general.

Algorithm 1 Determines the MERF of a word $w \in T$ and fills the MERF

procedure: $MERF(w)$
$q \leftarrow 0$
$w' \leftarrow w$
while w' has a nontrivial reading frame **do**
  $q \leftarrow q + 1$
  $w' \leftarrow$ **FillFrame**(w') {Determines and fills the extensible 2-reading frame}
  $w' \leftarrow m^{-1}(w')$
end while
return $m^q(w')$, 2^q "-reading frame."

To decide whether w has a nontrivial reading frame we can use Table 1 as lookup table, since there are only 6 words (3 patterns) with a trivial reading frame. For **FillFrame**(w') we use the same lookup table at the first 4 letters of w' to determine the 2-reading frame, then we find the frame prefix and suffix and fill them up. The original word w will occur only once as factor in $m^q(w')$. Let us look at an example.

Example 3.2. *What is* MERF(0110010)*?*
We start with $w = \underline{\lfloor 01\rfloor\lfloor 10\rfloor\lfloor 01\rfloor\lfloor 0}$ *and* $q = 0$*. Then we enter the while loop and get*

$$q = 1,\ \ FillFrame(w') = \underline{\lfloor 01\rfloor\lfloor 10\rfloor\lfloor 01\rfloor\lfloor 01\rfloor},\ \ m^{-1}(w') = \underline{0\rfloor\lfloor 10\rfloor\lfloor 0},$$

$$q = 2,\ \ FillFrame(w') = \underline{\lfloor 10\rfloor\lfloor 10\rfloor\lfloor 01\rfloor},\qquad m^{-1}(w') = \underline{1\rfloor\lfloor 10\rfloor},$$

$$q = 3,\ \ FillFrame(w') = \underline{\lfloor 01\rfloor\lfloor 10\rfloor},\qquad m^{-1}(w') = \underline{\lfloor 0\rfloor\lfloor 1\rfloor}.$$

Since $\underline{\lfloor 0\rfloor\lfloor 1\rfloor}$ *has a trivial reading frame we leave the while loop and the algorithm returns* MERF(0110010)*:* $\underline{\lfloor 01101001\rfloor\lfloor 10010110\rfloor}$ *8-reading frame.*

As a consequence of the algorithm we have the following lemma:

Lemma 3.3. *A factor w of the Thue–Morse word of length $2^q \leq |w| < 2^{q+1}$ has an extensible 2^{q-1}-reading frame.*

Proof. The output word of the algorithm is at least as long as the input word. The while loop of the algorithm will only end if it reaches a word with pattern $\mathrm{pat}(w) = \alpha\overline{\alpha}$ or $\mathrm{pat}(w) = \alpha\overline{\alpha}\alpha$. Hence the output word will have length $2 \cdot 2^i$ or $3 \cdot 2^i$ for $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$. But $3 \cdot 2^i \geq 2^q$ implies $i \geq q - 1$. □

Equipped with the algorithm, we are ready to prove the main theorem of this section. As usual we define $a \bmod b := a - \lfloor \frac{a}{b} \rfloor b$.

Theorem 3.4. *Any factor w of the infinite Thue–Morse with a given length $n := |w| = 2^q + r$, where $r < 2^q$ uniquely determines at least $u_{\min}(n)$ and at most $u_{\max}(n)$ letters where*

$$u_{\min}(n) := \begin{cases} 0 \text{ for } n = 1 \\ 0 \text{ for } n = 2 \\ 0 \text{ for } n = 3 \\ -n \bmod 2^{q-1} \text{ for } n > 3 \end{cases} \quad \text{and } u_{\max}(n) := \begin{cases} 0 \text{ for } n = 1 \\ 2 \text{ for } n = 2 \\ 1 \text{ for } n = 3 \\ 2^{\lfloor \log_2(n-2) \rfloor + 2} - n \text{ for } n > 3. \end{cases}$$

This bounds are sharp.

Proof. Table 1 allows us to check the cases with $n \leq 3$. Then we take a look at the function $u_{\min}(n)$. According to Lemma 3.3 the word w has an extensible 2^{q-1}-reading frame and therefore determines at least $2^{q-1} \cdot i - n$ letters for some $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$. But the smallest positive value of $2^{q-1} \cdot i - n$ is exactly $-n \bmod 2^{q-1}$. To show that it is actually possible to obtain this value for $r \leq 2^{q-1}$ and $r > 2^{q-1}$, take the first n letters of $f_{2^{q-1}}\overline{f_{2^{q-1}}}f_{2^{q-1}}$ and $f_{2^q}\overline{f_{2^q}}$, respectively.

To analyze the function $u_{\max}(n)$ we insert the word $w \in T^n$ in a 2^{q-1}-reading frame, which exists according to Lemma 3.3. A word of length 2^q or $2^q + 1$ can determine 3 frame words in the extensible 2^{q-1}-reading frame. So after $q - 1$ iterations of the while loop we have a word of length 3. We enter the while loop again, extend the word (in the best case) to length 4 and then map it via m^{-1} to a word with pattern $\alpha\overline{\alpha}$. So after q iterations we determined $2 \cdot 2^q$ letters.

If the word w has length $2^q + 2 \leq |w| \leq 2^q + 2^{q-1} + 1$ it can determine 4 frame words. So after $q - 1$ iterations we have a word of length 4 which (in the best case) has a 4-reading frame and gives therefore 2 further iterations before we end up in a word with pattern $\alpha\overline{\alpha}$. Here we determined $2 \cdot 2^{q+1}$ letters.

If $2^q + 2^{q-1} + 2 \leq |w| \leq 2^{q+1} - 1$ the word w can determine 5 frame words, so we have a word of length 5 after $q - 1$ iterations, extend it to length 6, map it to length 3 and (in the best case) extend it to length 4, before it is mapped to a word with pattern $\alpha\overline{\alpha}$. Again we determined $2 \cdot 2^{q+1}$ letters.

In each of these cases we determined $2^{\lfloor \log_2(n-2) \rfloor + 2} - n$ new letters, but we always assumed a best case. What is left is to show that there is always a word w, with $|w| = 2^q + r$, $r < 2^q$, so that the best case occurs. The first n letters of $\mathrm{suff}_1(f_{2^{q-1}})f_{2^{q-1}}\overline{f_{2^{q-1}}f_{2^{q-1}}}f_{2^{q-1}}$ form such a word. □

Let us look at the relative length $\frac{|w'|}{|w|}$ of an extension, where w is the input and w' is the output of the algorithm.

Lemma 3.5. *Let w be a factor of the Thue–Morse word and let w' be its unique extension. The relative length taken over all $w \in T$ satisfies* $\inf \frac{|w'|}{|w|} = 1$ *and* $\sup \frac{|w'|}{|w|} = 4$.

Proof. We have $\frac{|w'|}{|w|} = 1$ for the words $v = f_{2^q}\overline{f_{2^q}}$ of length $2 \cdot 2^q$ and $w = f_{2^q}\overline{f_{2^q}}f_{2^q}$ of length $3 \cdot 2^q$.

For the upper limit we look at the words $w_q = \mathrm{suff}_1(f_{2^{q-1}})f_{2^{q-1}}\overline{f_{2^{q-1}}}1$. These words of length $2^q + 2$ have an unique extension w'_q of length $4 \cdot 2^q$. Therefore we have $\lim_{q\to\infty} \frac{|w'_q|}{|w_q|} = \lim_{q\to\infty} \frac{4\cdot 2^q}{2^q+2} = 4$. □

Example 3.6. *The word $w = \underline{|}0110\underline{|}1001\underline{|}$ is a word of length 8 without an extension ($\frac{|w'|}{|w|} = 1$), while $v = \underline{0|}01101$ is a word of length 6 which can be extended to the word $v' = \underline{|}10010110\underline{|}01101001\underline{|}$ of length 16 ($\frac{|v'|}{|v|} = 8/3$).*

4 The odd frame and the short coding

In this section we compress the information in class(w) from Definition 1.4. From now on we call the extensible 2-reading frame also *even frame*. We can get an other reading frame if we shift the even frame one letter. This new reading fame is called *odd frame*.

We use these names since a given factor occurs an infinite number of times in the Thue–Morse word but always with the same parity (for $n > 3$) of the first letter. So a word is in the *even frame* if its first letter in the Thue–Morse word has even parity and it is in the *odd frame* otherwise.

Example 4.1. *A word* 01011 *can be read in the even frame $\underline{|}01\underline{|}01\underline{|}1$ or in the odd frame $\underline{0|}10\underline{|}11\underline{|}$.*

While the only two complete frame words in the even frame are 01 and 10 we have the four complete frame words $00, 01, 10$ and 11 in the odd frame. We call the odd frame words 00 and 11 *pairs*. The easiest way to find the odd frame of a word is to look for pairs, since pairs can only occur in the odd frame.

We define a *short coding* for odd frame words as: $\underline{|}01\underline{|}, \underline{|}10\underline{|} \mapsto$ **D**(ifferent), $\underline{|}00\underline{|}, \underline{|}11\underline{|} \mapsto$ **E**(qual) and finally $\underline{0|}, \underline{1|}, \underline{|}0, \underline{|}1 \mapsto$ **S**(hort).

An odd word without a prefix and suffix in the odd frame is called *pure odd word*. The study of pure odd words will turn out to be crucial for the rest of the paper. There is no **S** in the short coding of a pure odd word and all pure odd words have even length.

Example 4.2. *The word $v = 1100$ is a pure odd word since it has the odd frame $v = \underline{|}11\underline{|}00\underline{|}$ and the short coding* **EE**. *On the other hand the word $w = 01001$ is not a pure odd wort since the odd frame $w = \underline{|}01\underline{|}00\underline{|}1$ has a single letter suffix and therefore the short coding* **DES**.

If an odd frame word ends with one letter, the next one starts with another letter since $\underline{\alpha|}\underline{|\alpha}$ in the odd frame would be $\underline{|}\alpha\alpha\underline{|}$ in the even frame which can not occur. This fact allows us to recover a word w from its short coding if we know a single letter of w, and to recover pat(w) from the short coding too.

Example 4.3. *Take the word* $w = 1001011$*. It contains two pairs* $1\lfloor 00\rfloor 10\lfloor 11\rfloor$ *and has therefore the odd frame* $w = \underline{1}_\lfloor\underline{00}_\rfloor\underline{10}_\lfloor\underline{11}_\rfloor$*. The short coding* **SEDE** *gives the pattern* $\underline{\alpha}_\lfloor\underline{\alpha\overline{\alpha}}_\rfloor\underline{\alpha\overline{\alpha}}_\lfloor\underline{\alpha\alpha}_\rfloor$ *since* t *is cubefree. If we know* w_0 *we can recover* w *from its short coding.*

Thus we can switch between patterns in the odd frame and the short coding. We will use this in the following proofs.

Lemma 4.4. *The odd frame of the infinite Thue–Morse word has following properties:*

- *The sequence* **DD** *can not occur.*
- *The sequence* **DEED** *can not occur.*
- *The sequence* **EEEE** *can not occur.*

Proof.
- We showed in Example 2.3 that the word 0101 and therefore the pattern $\alpha\overline{\alpha}\alpha\overline{\alpha}$ is in the even frame.
- A word with pattern $\alpha\overline{\alpha}\alpha\alpha\overline{\alpha\alpha}\alpha\overline{\alpha}$ has no 4-reading frame and is therefore not in T.
- A word with pattern $\alpha\alpha\overline{\alpha\alpha}\alpha\alpha\overline{\alpha\alpha}$ has no 8-reading frame and is therefore not in T.

□

So at least every second letter in a short coding is an **E** and at most $3/4$ of the letters are **E**. This gives an upper bound for the growth of the 2-abelian complexity $\mathcal{P}_n$ of t. As consequence of Lemma 4.4 two consecutive **E** have either the form **EE** or **EDE** which corresponds to the patterns $\alpha\alpha\overline{\alpha\alpha}$ and $\alpha\alpha\overline{\alpha}\alpha\overline{\alpha\alpha}$. So we just proved the next Lemma.

Lemma 4.5. *The pairs* 00 *and* 11 *alternate in the odd frame.*

Now we will use the odd frame to compress the information from Definition 1.4. To achieve this we define a function $p\colon T \to \mathbb{N}_0,\ \ w \mapsto |w|_{00} + |w|_{11}$, which counts the pairs in a word w, and a function

$$r(w) := \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } w_0w_1 \text{ is in the odd frame;} \\ 1, & \text{if } w_0w_1 \text{ is in in the even frame;} \end{cases}$$

which determines the reading frame of w. This means a word w is a pure odd word if $r(w) = 0$ and $|w|$ is even. It would be possible to use the short coding to define $r(w)$: $r(w) = 1$ if the short coding of w starts with **S** and $r(w) = 0$ otherwise.

With the two functions $p(w)$ and $r(w)$ we can collect all information necessary to determine the 2-abelian equivalence class of a word w in a 3-tuple:

$$\operatorname{tup}\colon T \to \mathbb{N}_0 \times \{0,1\}^2,\ \ w \mapsto (w_0, p(w), r(w)).$$

Example 4.6. *Let us look at Example 1.5 again. For the word* $w = 10011010$ *we have now* $\operatorname{tup}(w) = (1, 2, 1)$.

In the next theorem we show that we have all information of class(w) in tup(w), we can recover class(w) from tup(w). We will use the *XOR* operator $\oplus$ and the Iverson bracket $[\![S]\!]$ which is 1 if the statement S is true and 0 otherwise.

Lemma 4.7. *Let w be a word of length n. There is a function h so that*

$$h(\text{tup}(w)) = \text{class}(w).$$

For two words $v, w \in T^n$ with $v \neq w$, we have $h(\text{tup}(v)) = h(\text{tup}(w))$ if and only if $v_0 = w_0$, $p(v) = p(w)$ and $p(v)$ is even.

Proof. The basic idea is to use parity arguments. If we take w and erase one letter from every pair, we get a sequence of length $|w| - p(w)$ which alternates between 0 and 1 and starts with w_0. Since the sequence has the same number of 01 and 10 as w, we can use it to determine $|w|_{01}$, $|w|_{10}$ and the last letter w_n.

The pairs already form an alternating sequence (Lemma 4.5), so we only need to identify the first pair. In the odd frame a word can start either with **E** which corresponds to the pattern $\alpha\alpha$ or with **DE** which corresponds to the pattern $\alpha\overline{\alpha}\alpha\alpha$. In both cases the first pair is w_0w_0.

In the even frame a word starts with **SE** which corresponds to the pattern $\alpha\overline{\alpha\alpha}$ or with **SDE** which corresponds to the pattern $\alpha\overline{\alpha}\alpha\overline{\alpha\alpha}$. In both cases the first pair is $\overline{w_0w_0}$. This allows us to determine $|w|_{00}$, $|w|_{11}$. We can also give these values in an explicit form as

$$h\colon (w_0, p(w), r(w)) \mapsto (a, b, c, d, w_0, e)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
a &= \lfloor \tfrac{p(w)}{2} \rfloor + [\![p(w) \text{ odd}]\!][\![w_0 = 0]\!] \\
b &= \lfloor \tfrac{|w|-p(w)}{2} \rfloor + [\![|w| - p(w) \text{ even}]\!][\![w_0 = 0]\!] \\
c &= \lfloor \tfrac{|w|-p(w)}{2} \rfloor + [\![|w| - p(w) \text{ even}]\!][\![w_0 = 1]\!] \\
d &= \lfloor \tfrac{p(w)}{2} \rfloor + [\![p(w) \text{ odd}]\!][\![w_0 = 1]\!] \\
e &= [\![|w| - p(w) \text{ even}]\!] \oplus w_0.
\end{aligned}$$

Let $v, w \in T$ with $v \neq w$ now be two words that belong to the same equivalence class. Then $v_0 = w_0$ and $p(v) = p(w)$, so they can only differ in the reading frame with $r(v) \neq r(w)$. The reading frame determines the first pair in the alternating pair sequence. If $p(w)$ is even, the numbers $|w|_{00}$ and $|w|_{11}$ do not depend on $r(w)$. So $h(\text{tup}(v)) = h(\text{tup}(w))$ for $v \neq w$ if and only if $v_0 = w_0$, $p(v) = p(w)$ and $p(w)$ is even. □

The idea of Lemma 4.7 is to gather more information in less memory. We need two boolean and four integer variables for class(w) while tup(w) uses only one integer and two boolean variables.

Example 4.8. *We have* class$(w) =$ class(v) *for the two words* $w = 011001$ *and* $v = 001011$ *but* tup$(w) \neq$ tup(v) *since* $r(w) = 1$ *and* $r(v) = 0$. *So* tup *can distinguish more words than* class.

With Lemma 4.7 we can determine the 2-abelian complexity $\mathcal{P}_n$ of t if we know the possible values of $\mathrm{tup}(w)$, for $w \in T_n$. Which are the possible values of $\mathrm{tup}(w)$?

The boolean variables can be 0 or 1 since a word $w \in T_n$ can start either with 0 or 1 and can be in the even frame or in the odd frame. The difficult part is to find the possible values of $p(w)$. In the next section we will find a method to obtain them.

5 On pairs

We are interested in how many pairs can occur in a word in T_n. So we define $\mathbf{pairs}(n) := \{p(w) \mid w \in T_n\}$. It will emerge that we will need a second set $\mathbf{PAIRS}(2n) := \{p(w) \mid r(w) = 0,\, w \in T_{2n}\}$. The value $\mathbf{PAIRS}(n)$ is undefined for odd n. The elements of $\mathbf{PAIRS}(2n)$ are the possible numbers of $\mathbf{E}$ in pure odd words of length $2n$.

Example 5.1. *Let us determine* $\mathbf{pairs}(6)$ *and* $\mathbf{PAIRS}(6)$.

Pattern	*Coding*	$p(w)$
$\alpha\alpha\overline{\alpha}\alpha\overline{\alpha}\overline{\alpha}$	**EDE**	2
$\alpha\alpha\overline{\alpha}\overline{\alpha}\alpha\alpha$	**EEE**	3
$\alpha\alpha\overline{\alpha}\overline{\alpha}\alpha\overline{\alpha}$	**EED**	2
$\alpha\overline{\alpha}\alpha\alpha\overline{\alpha}\alpha$	**DED**	1

Pattern	*Coding*	$p(w)$
$\alpha\overline{\alpha}\alpha\alpha\overline{\alpha}\overline{\alpha}$	**DEE**	2
$\alpha\overline{\alpha}\alpha\overline{\alpha}\overline{\alpha}\alpha$	**SDES**	1
$\alpha\overline{\alpha}\overline{\alpha}\alpha\alpha\overline{\alpha}$	**SEES**	2
$\alpha\overline{\alpha}\overline{\alpha}\alpha\overline{\alpha}\alpha$	**SEDS**	1

So $\mathbf{pairs}(6) = \mathbf{PAIRS}(6) = \{1, 2, 3\}$.

It is not always the case that $\mathbf{pairs}(2n) = \mathbf{PAIRS}(2n)$. For example $\mathbf{pairs}(8) = \{1, 2, 3\}$ while $\mathbf{PAIRS}(8) = \{2, 3\}$.

The following theorem is the main tool to prove results about the 2-abelian complexity $\mathcal{P}_n$, since all properties of $\mathcal{P}_n$ can be obtained from the properties of $\mathbf{pairs}(n)$ and $\mathbf{PAIRS}(n)$.

Theorem 5.2. *For* $n \geq 4$ *the sets* $\mathbf{pairs}(n)$ *and* $\mathbf{PAIRS}(n)$ *fulfill the recursions*

$$\mathbf{PAIRS}(2n) = n - \mathbf{pairs}(n+1) \tag{1}$$

$$\mathbf{pairs}(2n+1) = \mathbf{PAIRS}(2n) \tag{2}$$

$$\mathbf{pairs}(2n) = \mathbf{PAIRS}(2n) \cup \mathbf{PAIRS}(2n-2) \tag{3}$$

with $n - \mathbf{pairs}(n+1) := \{n - y \mid y \in \mathbf{pairs}(n+1)\}$.

Proof. The proof works only for $n \geq 4$ since we distinguish between even and odd frame and words of length $n < 4$ may not have a defined 2-reading frame.

Let $w \in T_{n+1}$. We have $|w|_{01} + |w|_{10} = n - p(w)$ since w has n factors of length 2. The image $m(w)$ has length $2n + 2$ and is in the even frame. We remove the prefix and the suffix of $m(w)$ to get a pure odd word w' of length $2n$. We have a pair 00 in w' if and only if there is a 10 in w and a pair 11 in w' if and only if there is a 01 in w. Thus $p(w') = n - p(w)$. Since the steps to get from w to w' are bijective, the two sets $\mathbf{PAIRS}(2n)$ and $n - \mathbf{pairs}(n+1)$ are equal.

All words $w \in T_{2n+1}$ are of the form $w'\mathbf{S}$ or $\mathbf{S}w'$ where w' is a pure odd word of length $2n$. Since $p(w') = p(w'\mathbf{S}) = p(\mathbf{S}w')$ the bijection $w' \mapsto w'\mathbf{S}$ proves $\mathbf{pairs}(2n+1) = \mathbf{PAIRS}(2n)$.

Every word in $w \in T_{2n}$ is either of the form w' or $\mathbf{S}w''\mathbf{S}$, where w' is a pure odd word of length $2n$ and w'' is a pure odd word of length $2n-2$. Again, adding and removing $\mathbf{S}$ is a bijection which does not change the number of pairs. Therefore $\mathbf{pairs}(2n) = \mathbf{PAIRS}(2n) \cup \mathbf{PAIRS}(2n-2)$. □

We write $[a, b]$ to denote the interval of all integers between a and b, including both. The integer interval $[a, b]$ has cardinality $\#[a, b] = b - a + 1$. For a set S we define $\#_2 S$, the number of even elements in S, as

$$\#_2 S := \#\{s \in S \mid s \equiv 0 \pmod 2\}.$$

Lemma 5.3. *The sets* $\mathbf{pairs}(n)$ *and* $\mathbf{PAIRS}(2n)$ *are integer intervals.*

Proof. This is true for $n < 10$ (cf. Table 2). All other values can be calculated using Theorem 5.2. In cases (1) and (2) of Theorem 5.2 it is obvious that integer intervals are mapped to integer intervals, we just have to show that $\mathbf{PAIRS}(2n) \cup \mathbf{PAIRS}(2n-2)$ is an integer interval. This is true, since we know from the definition of $\mathbf{PAIRS}(2n)$ that the upper and lower limit of two consecutive sets can differ only by 1. □

n	$\mathbf{PAIRS}(n)$	$\mathbf{pairs}(n)$	$\mathcal{P}_n$
0	{0}	{0}	1
1		{0}	2
2	{0,1}	{0,1}	4
3		{0,1}	6
4	{1,2}	{0,1,2}	8

n	$\mathbf{PAIRS}(n)$	$\mathbf{pairs}(n)$	$\mathcal{P}_n$
5		{1,2}	6
6	{1,2,3}	{1,2,3}	8
7		{1,2,3}	10
8	{2,3}	{1,2,3}	8
9		{2,3}	6

Table 2: Small values of the functions

In the next theorem we determine the number of 2-abelian equivalence classes.

Lemma 5.4. *For* $n \geq 4$ *the number of* 2*-abelian equivalence classes* $\mathcal{P}_n$ *is given by the two formulas*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{P}_{2n+1} &= 2(2\#\mathbf{PAIRS}(2n) - \#_2\mathbf{PAIRS}(2n)) \\ \mathcal{P}_{2n} &= 2(\#\mathbf{PAIRS}(2n) + \#\mathbf{PAIRS}(2n-2) \\ &\qquad - \#_2(\mathbf{PAIRS}(2n) \cap \mathbf{PAIRS}(2n-2))).\end{aligned}$$

Proof. This is an immediate consequence of Lemma 4.7 and Theorem 5.2. First we look at $\mathcal{P}_{2n}$. We want to find all possible values of $\mathrm{tup}(w)$ for $w \in T_{2n}$. We have $\#\mathbf{PAIRS}(2n)$ possibilities to choose $p(w)$ in the odd frame and we have $\#\mathbf{PAIRS}(2n-2)$ possibilities to choose $p(w)$ in the even frame. If there is an even value $p(w)$ in both frames, the odd frame and the even frame give the same equivalence class so we subtract $\#_2(\mathbf{PAIRS}(2n) \cap \mathbf{PAIRS}(2n-2))$. Finally we multiply by 2 since w_0 can be 0 or 1.

We use the same argument for $\mathcal{P}_{2n+1}$ but we have $\mathbf{PAIRS}(2n)$ possible pairs in both frames and therefore also the intersection. □

Now we look at several sets, because for even numbers the recursion needs two sets. If we know $\mathbf{pairs}(n)$ and $\mathbf{pairs}(n+1)$, we can use Theorem 5.2 to determine $\mathbf{PAIRS}(2n-2)$ and $\mathbf{PAIRS}(2n)$ and thus $\mathbf{pairs}(2n-1)$, $\mathbf{pairs}(2n)$ and $\mathbf{pairs}(2n+1)$. With Lemma 5.4 we can then determine $\mathcal{P}_{2n-1}$, $\mathcal{P}_{2n}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{2n+1}$.

It is clear from the definition of $\mathbf{pairs}(n)$ that the sequence $\min \mathbf{pairs}(n)$ is monotonically increasing in steps of 0 or 1:

$$\min \mathbf{pairs}(n+1) - \min \mathbf{pairs}(n) \in \{0, 1\}.$$

This also holds for $\max \mathbf{pairs}(n)$, $\min \mathbf{PAIRS}(n)$ and $\max \mathbf{PAIRS}(n)$. So if $\mathbf{pairs}(n) = [a, b]$ we have four possibilities for $\mathbf{pairs}(n+1)$:

$$[a, b],\ \ [a+1, b],\ \ [a, b+1] \text{ and } [a+1, b+1].$$

Now we use Theorem 5.2 to make Table 3.

If we observe small values of the sequence $\mathbf{pairs}(n)$ we see that the *IV.* case does not occur. The column $\mathbf{PAIRS}(2n+i)$ of Table 3 shows that case *IV.* can also not occur as image of smaller values. Therefore the case *IV.* can not occur anywhere and we have just proved:

$$\mathbf{PAIRS}(2n-2) \neq \mathbf{PAIRS}(2n) \text{ and } \mathbf{pairs}(n+1) \neq 1 + \mathbf{pairs}(n). \qquad (4)$$

Case	i	$\mathbf{pairs}(n+i)$	$\mathbf{PAIRS}(2n+i)$	$\mathbf{pairs}(2n+i)$	$\mathbf{PAIRS}(4n+i)$	$\mathbf{pairs}(4n+i)$
I.	−2		$[n-b-1, n-a-1]$		$[n+a-1, n+b]$	
	−1			$[n-b-1, n-a-1]$		$[n+a-1, n+b]$
	0	$[a, b]$	$[n-b, n-a]$	$[n-b-1, n-a]$	$[n+a, n+b]$	$[n+a-1, n+b]$
	+1	$[a, b]$		$[n-b, n-a]$		$[n+a, n+b]$
II.	−2		$[n-b-1, n-a-1]$		$[n+a, n+b]$	
	−1			$[n-b-1, n-a-1]$		$[n+a, n+b]$
	0	$[a, b]$	$[n-b, n-a-1]$	$[n-b-1, n-a-1]$	$[n+a+1, n+b]$	$[n+a, n+b]$
	+1	$[a+1, b]$		$[n-b, n-a-1]$		$[n+a+1, n+b]$
III.	−2		$[n-b-1, n-a-1]$		$[n+a-1, n+b]$	
	−1			$[n-b-1, n-a-1]$		$[n+a-1, n+b]$
	0	$[a, b]$	$[n-b-1, n-a]$	$[n-b-1, n-a]$	$[n+a, n+b+1]$	$[n+a-1, n+b+1]$
	+1	$[a, b+1]$		$[n-b-1, n-a]$		$[n+a, n+b+1]$
IV.	−2		$[n-b-1, n-a-1]$		$[n+a, n+b]$	
	−1			$[n-b-1, n-a-1]$		$[n+a, n+b]$
	0	$[a, b]$	$[n-b-1, n-a-1]$	$[n-b-1, n-a-1]$	$[n+a+1, n+b+1]$	$[n+a, n+b+1]$
	+1	$[a+1, b+1]$		$[n-b-1, n-a-1]$		$[n+a+1, n+b+1]$

Table 3: Behavior of integer intervals under the maps $\mathbf{pairs}(n)$ and $\mathbf{PAIRS}(n)$.

Example 5.5. *Let us take a look at the first case in Table 3. We start with the two sets* $\mathbf{pairs}(n) = [a, b]$ *and* $\mathbf{pairs}(n+1) = [a, b]$*. Now we use Equation (1) of Theorem 5.2 and get*

$$\mathbf{PAIRS}(2n) = n - \mathbf{pairs}(n+1) = n - [a, b] = [n-b, n-a]$$

and

$$\mathbf{PAIRS}(2n-2) = n - 1 - \mathbf{pairs}(n) = n - 1 - [a, b] = [n-b-1, n-a-1].$$

Then we use Theorem 5.2 Equation (2) to get

$$\mathbf{pairs}(2n-1) = \mathbf{PAIRS}(2n-2) = [n-b-1, n-a-1]$$

and

$$\mathbf{pairs}(2n+1) = \mathbf{PAIRS}(2n) = [n-b, n-a].$$

Finally we use use Theorem 5.2 Equation (3) and get

$$\mathbf{pairs}(2n) = \mathbf{PAIRS}(2n-2) \cup \mathbf{PAIRS}(2n) = [n-b-1, n-a-1] \cup [n-b, n-a] =$$

$$= [n-b-1, n-a].$$

We continue in the same manner to complete Table 3.

From the way we made Table 3 we can also deduce the next lemma about consecutive values of $\mathbf{pairs}(n)$, $\mathbf{PAIRS}(n)$ and $\mathcal{P}_n$.

Lemma 5.6. *If we know* $\mathbf{pairs}(n)$ *for all* $n \in [a, b]$ *we can determine* $\mathbf{pairs}(n')$ *and* $\mathcal{P}_{n'}$ *for* $n' \in [2a-1, 2b-1]$ *and* $\mathbf{PAIRS}(n'')$ *for* $n'' \in [2a-2, 2b-2]$.

Remark *An especially interesting case of Lemma 5.6 is to go from* $\mathbf{pairs}(n)$, $n \in [2^{q-1}+1, 2^q+1]$ *to* $\mathbf{pairs}(n')$, $n' \in [2^q+1; 2^{q+1}+1]$. *This is the idea behind the proof of Theorem 7.3.*

6 The sequence $\mathcal{P}_n$ is 2-regular

We will prove Theorem 1.1 by proving the 13 relations of Theorem 1.1.* which generate all sequences for the $\mathbb{Z}$-kernel. If Theorem 1.1.* is true the $\mathbb{Z}$-kernel is finitely generated and Theorem 1.1 follows.

Theorem 1.1.* *The $\mathbb{Z}$-kernel of the Thue-Morse word is generated by the* 13 *relations:*

1. $\mathcal{P}_{4n+1} = \mathcal{P}_{2n+1}$
2. $\mathcal{P}_{8n+4} = \mathcal{P}_{8n+3} + \mathcal{P}_{4n+3} - \mathcal{P}_{4n+2}$
3. $\mathcal{P}_{16n} = \mathcal{P}_{8n}$
4. $\mathcal{P}_{16n+2} = \mathcal{P}_{8n+2}$
5. $\mathcal{P}_{16n+6} = -\mathcal{P}_{16n+3} + \mathcal{P}_{8n+3} + 3\mathcal{P}_{8n+2} + \mathcal{P}_{4n+3} - 2\mathcal{P}_{4n+2} - \mathcal{P}_{2n+1}$
6. $\mathcal{P}_{16n+7} = -\mathcal{P}_{16n+3} + \mathcal{P}_{8n+3} + 3\mathcal{P}_{8n+2} + 2\mathcal{P}_{4n+3} - 3\mathcal{P}_{4n+2} - \mathcal{P}_{2n+1}$
7. $\mathcal{P}_{16n+8} = \mathcal{P}_{8n+2} + \mathcal{P}_{4n+3} - \mathcal{P}_{2n+1}$
8. $\mathcal{P}_{16n+10} = \mathcal{P}_{8n+2} + \mathcal{P}_{4n+3} - \mathcal{P}_{2n+1}$
9. $\mathcal{P}_{16n+11} = -\mathcal{P}_{16n+3} + 3\mathcal{P}_{8n+2} + \mathcal{P}_{4n+3} - 2\mathcal{P}_{2n+1}$
10. $\mathcal{P}_{16n+14} = \mathcal{P}_{16n+3} + \mathcal{P}_{8n+7} - \mathcal{P}_{8n+3} - \mathcal{P}_{8n+2} - \mathcal{P}_{4n+3} + 3\mathcal{P}_{4n+2} - \mathcal{P}_{2n+1}$
11. $\mathcal{P}_{16n+15} = \mathcal{P}_{16n+3} + 2\mathcal{P}_{8n+7} - 3\mathcal{P}_{8n+6} - 2\mathcal{P}_{8n+3} + 6\mathcal{P}_{4n+2} - 3\mathcal{P}_{2n+1}$
12. $\mathcal{P}_{32n+3} = \mathcal{P}_{8n+3}$

13. $\mathcal{P}_{32n+19} = -\mathcal{P}_{16n+3} + \mathcal{P}_{8n+3} + 3\mathcal{P}_{8n+2} + 2\mathcal{P}_{4n+3} - 3\mathcal{P}_{4n+2} - \mathcal{P}_{2n+1}$

Proof. If we observe the right hand side of these 13 relations we see that every sequence $\mathcal{P}_{2^q n+r}$ is a linear combination of $\mathcal{P}_{2n+1}$, $\mathcal{P}_{4n+2}$, $\mathcal{P}_{4n+3}$, $\mathcal{P}_{8n}$, $\mathcal{P}_{8n+2}$, $\mathcal{P}_{8n+3}$, $\mathcal{P}_{8n+6}$, $\mathcal{P}_{8n+7}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{16n+3}$.

To see that these 13 relations generate all sequences for the $\mathbb{Z}$-kernel we just have to check that the left hand side of this 13 relations cover all residue classes modulo 32. Please note that we have to write all relations modulo 32, so e.g. instead of $\mathcal{P}_{16n+7}$ we write $\mathcal{P}_{16(2n)+7} = \mathcal{P}_{32n+7}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{16(2n+1)+7} = \mathcal{P}_{32n+23}$. □

These relations have been found by computer experiments by Parreau, Rigo and Vandomme. An algorithm for finding such relations for an ℓ-abelian sequence can be found in Chapter 6 of [3]. We will prove the relations one by one by a four step approach.

In this four step approach Table 4 will be used in the second and third step[1]. It has been generated in the same manner as Table 3 starting with all three possibilities for the relative sizes of **pairs**$(n+1)$ and **pairs**$(n+2)$.

So let us now describe the four steps in detail, we will need them over and over again for all thirteen relations.

First step We move all terms of a relation to the right hand side and replace them there using Lemma 5.4. We then divide the whole equation by 2 (as consequence of Lemma 5.4 all $\mathcal{P}_n$ are even for $n > 0$).

Example 6.1 (Relation 1)**.** *To make the steps clearer we will prove Relation 1 as example. To prove* $\mathcal{P}_{4n+1} = \mathcal{P}_{2n+1}$ *we move all terms to the right side.*

$$0 = -\mathcal{P}_{4n+1} + \mathcal{P}_{2n+1}$$

Now we use Lemma 5.4 to replace them and get

$$0 = -2(2\#\mathbf{PAIRS}(4n) - \#_2\mathbf{PAIRS}(4n)) + 2(2\#\mathbf{PAIRS}(2n) - \#_2\mathbf{PAIRS}(2n)).$$

Finally divide this equation by 2 *to get*

$$0 = -(2\#\mathbf{PAIRS}(4n) - \#_2\mathbf{PAIRS}(4n)) + (2\#\mathbf{PAIRS}(2n) - \#_2\mathbf{PAIRS}(2n)).$$

Second step We use Table 4 to substitute the term $\#\mathbf{PAIRS}(.)$ by cardinalities of suitably chosen integer intervals (we keep $\#_2\mathbf{PAIRS}(.)$).

Since there are three cases we will now have three equations. We calculate the cardinalities on the right hand side in all three cases, simplify until we have a single integer and put the result into a triple $(\mathrm{rhs}_1, \mathrm{rhs}_2, \mathrm{rhs}_3)$, where rhs_i is the integer on the right hand side in the i-th case.

Example 6.2 (Relation 1, continued)**.** *We start with*

$$0 = -(2\#\mathbf{PAIRS}(4n) - \#_2\mathbf{PAIRS}(4n)) + (2\#\mathbf{PAIRS}(2n) - \#_2\mathbf{PAIRS}(2n)).$$

We look at case I. of Table 4 and substitute $\#\mathbf{PAIRS}(2n) = \#[n-b, n-a]$ *and* $\#\mathbf{PAIRS}(4n) = \#[n+a, n+b]$ *to get*

$$0 = -2\#[n+a, n+b] + \#_2\mathbf{PAIRS}(4n) + 2\#[n-b, n-a] - \#_2\mathbf{PAIRS}(2n).$$

[1] For Relation 3 we need a different table.

Now we calculate the cardinalities. Since $\#[a,b] = b-a+1$ *we get*

$$0 = -2(b-a+1)+\#_2\mathbf{PAIRS}(4n)+2(b-a+1)-\#_2\mathbf{PAIRS}(2n).$$

This can be simplified to

$$0 = \#_2\mathbf{PAIRS}(4n)-\#_2\mathbf{PAIRS}(2n)$$

so the integer in case I. is 0*. The other two cases are identical and we get*

$$0 = \#_2\mathbf{PAIRS}(4n)-\#_2\mathbf{PAIRS}(2n) + (0,0,0).$$

This is a shorthand for three (identical) equations. Most times two or even three cases will be identical.

Third step We will use Table 4 again to substitute the cardinalities $\#_2\mathbf{PAIRS}(.)$ in all three cases and intersect them if necessary.

Example 6.3 (Relation 1, continued)**.** *In all three cases we get*

$$0 = \#_2[n+a, n+b]-\#_2[n-b, n-a].$$

Fourth step Now we deal with the number of even elements in integer intervals. If two intervals of the same size with different signs contain the same number of even elements they cancel. If the do not cancel (because their borders have the wrong parity) or have different sizes we split off Iverson brackets from the beginning or end of the larger set until both sets have the same parity of limits and the same cardinality

$$\#_2[a,b] = [\![a \text{ even}]\!] + \#_2[a+1,b]; \quad \#_2[a,b] = \#_2[a,b-1] + [\![b \text{ even}]\!].$$

To check two intervals of the same size with different signs contain the same number of even elements we use the following procedure, which we call *normalization*:

- Replace all even numbers by 0 and all odd numbers by 1.
- Change all "−" signs to "+" signs.
- If an a occurs in the upper limit of a set we change the upper and lower limit.

Its easy to see that parity of the interval borders does not chance during the procedure, basically we calculate modulo 2. It does however change the size of the intervals so it is important to use normalization only on intervals of the same size.

Example 6.4. *We want to show that*

$$0 = -\#_2[5n+a+1, 5n+b+2] + \#_2[3n-b, 3n-a+1].$$

Both sides have the same cardinality $b-a+2$*, therefore we can normalize them:*

$$\begin{aligned}
-\#_2[5n+a+1, 5n+b+2] + \#_2[3n-b, 3n-a+1] &= \\
= -\#_2[n+a+1, n+b] + \#_2[n-b, n-a+1] &= \\
= -\#_2[n+a+1, n+b] + \#_2[n+b, n+a+1] &= \\
= -\#_2[n+a+1, n+b] + \#_2[n+a+1, n+b] &= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Example 6.5 (Relation 1, continued)**.** *In all three cases we have*

$$0 = \#_2[n{+}a, n{+}b]{-}\#_2[n{-}b, n{-}a].$$

Since the sets have the same cardinality so we normalize and get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \#_2[n{+}a, n{+}b]{-}\#_2[n{-}b, n{-}a] = \\ = \#_2[n{+}a, n{+}b]{-}\#_2[n{+}b, n{+}a] = \\ = \#_2[n{+}a, n{+}b]{-}\#_2[n{+}a, n{+}b] \end{aligned}$$

which is true.

The only non mechanical step in the whole procedure is step four. Sometimes we have to split intervals before we can normalize. This will be mentioned in the proof. After these four steps we will have an equation which is trivially true.

Proof of Theorem 1.1.

1. This is shown in the example.
2. We will show the first relation in more detail. We want to prove

$$0 = -\mathcal{P}_{8n+4} + \mathcal{P}_{8n+3} + \mathcal{P}_{4n+3} - \mathcal{P}_{4n+2}.$$

In the first step we use Lemma 5.4 and divide by 2 to get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 =& -\#\mathbf{PAIRS}(8n{+}4){-}\#\mathbf{PAIRS}(8n{+}2){+}\#_2(\mathbf{PAIRS}(8n{+}4) \cap \mathbf{PAIRS}(8n{+}2)) \\ &+2\#\mathbf{PAIRS}(8n{+}2){-}\#_2\mathbf{PAIRS}(8n{+}2){+}2\#\mathbf{PAIRS}(4n{+}2){-}\#_2\mathbf{PAIRS}(4n{+}2) \\ &-\#\mathbf{PAIRS}(4n{+}2){-}\#\mathbf{PAIRS}(4n){+}\#_2(\mathbf{PAIRS}(4n{+}2) \cap \mathbf{PAIRS}(4n)). \end{aligned}$$

For the second step we substitute the intervals from Table 4. With the shorthand $\mathcal{C} := b{-}a{+}1$ we get in the first case (where $\mathbf{pairs}(n{+}1) = [a, b]$ and $\mathbf{pairs}(n+2) = [a, b]$)

$$\begin{aligned} 0 =& -2\mathcal{C}{-}2{+}\#_2(\mathbf{PAIRS}(8n{+}4) \cap \mathbf{PAIRS}(8n{+}2)){+}2\mathcal{C}{+}2{-}\#_2\mathbf{PAIRS}(8n{+}2) \\ &+2\mathcal{C}{+}2{-}\#_2\mathbf{PAIRS}(4n{+}2){-}2\mathcal{C}{-}1{+}\#_2(\mathbf{PAIRS}(4n{+}2) \cap \mathbf{PAIRS}(4n)). \end{aligned}$$

Most terms cancel and we have 1 remaining on the right hand side. It turns out this is also true in the two other cases so our triple is $(1, 1, 1)$ and we get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 =& + \#_2(\mathbf{PAIRS}(8n{+}4) \cap \mathbf{PAIRS}(8n{+}2)) - \#_2\mathbf{PAIRS}(8n{+}2) \\ &- \#_2\mathbf{PAIRS}(4n{+}2) + \#_2(\mathbf{PAIRS}(4n{+}2) \cap \mathbf{PAIRS}(4n)) + (1, 1, 1). \end{aligned}$$

Now we apply the third step, intersect the sets and get in all three cases

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = &+ \#_2[3n{-}b{+}1, 3n{-}a{+}1] - \#_2[3n{-}b, 3n{-}a{+}1] \\ &- \#_2[n{+}a, n{+}b{+}1] + \#_2[n{+}a, n{+}b] + 1. \end{aligned}$$

In the fourth step we can not normalize, so we split off Iverson brackets and get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = &+ \#_2[3n{-}b{+}1, 3n{-}a{+}1] - [\![3n - b \text{ even}]\!] - \#_2[3n{-}b{+}1, 3n{-}a{+}1] \\ &- \#_2[n{+}a, n{+}b] - [\![n + b + 1 \text{ even}]\!] + \#_2[n{+}a, n{+}b] + 1. \end{aligned}$$

The intervals cancel and we are left with the true equation

$$0 = -[\![3n - b \text{ even}]\!] - [\![n + b + 1 \text{ even}]\!] + 1,$$

in all three cases.

3. We can get the values needed if we extend Table 3.

i	**PAIRS**$(8n+i)$	**PAIRS**$(16n+i)$
-2	$[3n-b-1, 3n-a]$	$[5n+a-1, 5n+b]$
0	$[3n-b, 3n-a]$	$[5n+a, 5n+b]$
-2	$[3n-b-1, 3n-a-1]$	$[5n+a, 5n+b]$
0	$[3n-b, 3n-a-1]$	$[5n+a+1, 5n+b]$
-2	$[3n-b-2, 3n-a]$	$[5n+a-1, 5n+b+1]$
0	$[3n-b-1, 3n-a]$	$[5n+a, 5n+b+1]$

The triple is $(0, 0, 0)$. The rest is a straightforward. In the fourth step we just have to normalize.

4. Similar to relation 3. but with values from Table 4. The triple is $(0, 0, 0)$ and we just have to normalize.

5. After the first two steps we get the triple $(0, 1, 0)$. Please note that the sets in cases I. and III. are identical, so we can ignore case III. In the first case we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = &- 3\overbrace{\#_2[3n-b, 3n-a]}^{8n+2} + 2\overbrace{\#_2[n+a, n+b]}^{4n+2} + \overbrace{\#_2[n-b, n-a]}^{2n+1} \\ &- \overbrace{\#_2[n+a, n+b+1]}^{4n+3} + \overbrace{\#_2[5n+a, 5n+b+1]}^{16n+3} \\ &+ \overbrace{\#_2[5n+a+1, 5n+b+2]}^{16n+6} - \overbrace{\#_2[3n-b, 3n-a+1]}^{8n+3} \end{aligned}$$

where all terms in a single line normalize to zero.

In the second case we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = &+ \overbrace{\#_2[5n+a+2, 5n+b+2]}^{16n+6} + \overbrace{\#_2[n-b, n-a]}^{2n+1} - 2\overbrace{\#_2[3n-b, 3n-a]}^{8n+2} \\ &- \overbrace{\#_2[3n-b, 3n-a]}^{8n+2} + 2\overbrace{\#_2[n+a+1, n+b]}^{4n+2} - \overbrace{\#_2[3n-b, 3n-a+1]}^{8n+3} \\ &- \overbrace{\#_2[n+a+1, n+b+1]}^{4n+3} + \overbrace{\#_2[5n+a, 5n+b+1]}^{16n+3} + 1 \end{aligned}$$

where all terms in the first line normalize to zero. We then split off Iverson brackets to get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = &- \#_2[3n-b, 3n-a] + \#_2[5n+a, 5n+b] + [\![5n+b+1 \text{ even}]\!] \\ &- \#_2[n+a+1, n+b] - [\![n+b+1 \text{ even}]\!] + \#_2[n+a+1, n+b] \\ &- \#_2[3n-b, 3n-a+1] + \#_2[n+a+1, n+b] + 1. \end{aligned}$$

The first two lines cancel. We split the first interval two times and get

$$-\#_2[3n-b, 3n-a-1] - [\![3n-a \text{ even}]\!] - [\![3n-a+1 \text{ even}]\!] + \#_2[n+a+1, n+b] + 1,$$

and finally

$$0 = -[\![3n-a \text{ even}]\!] - [\![3n-a+1 \text{ even}]\!] + 1.$$

Case	i	**pairs**$(n+i)$	**PAIRS**$(2n+i)$	**PAIRS**$(4n+i)$	**PAIRS**$(8n+i)$	**PAIRS**$(16n+i)$	**PAIRS**$(32n+i)$
	0		$[n-b, n-a]$	$[n+a, n+b]$	$[3n-b, 3n-a]$	$[5n+a, 5n+b]$	$[11n-b, 11n-a]$
	1	$[a, b]$					
	2	$[a, b]$	$[n-b+1, n-a+1]$	$[n+a, n+b+1]$	$[3n-b, 3n-a+1]$	$[5n+a, 5n+b+1]$	$[11n-b, 11n-a+1]$
	4			$[n+a+1, n+b+1]$	$[3n-b+1, 3n-a+2]$	$[5n+a+1, 5n+b+2]$	$[11n-b+1, 11n-a+2]$
	6				$[3n-b+2, 3n-a+3]$	$[5n+a+1, 5n+b+3]$	$[11n-b+1, 11n-a+3]$
I.	8				$[3n-b+3, 3n-a+3]$	$[5n+a+2, 5n+b+3]$	$[11n-b+2, 11n-a+3]$
	10					$[5n+a+2, 5n+b+4]$	$[11n-b+2, 11n-a+4]$
	12					$[5n+a+3, 5n+b+4]$	$[11n-b+3, 11n-a+5]$
	14					$[5n+a+4, 5n+b+5]$	$[11n-b+4, 11n-a+6]$
	16					$[5n+a+5, 5n+b+5]$	$[11n-b+5, 11n-a+6]$
	18						$[11n-b+5, 11n-a+7]$
	0		$[n-b, n-a]$	$[n+a, n+b]$	$[3n-b, 3n-a]$	$[5n+a, 5n+b]$	$[11n-b, 11n-a]$
	1	$[a, b]$					
	2	$[a+1, b]$	$[n-b+1, n-a]$	$[n+a+1, n+b+1]$	$[3n-b, 3n-a+1]$	$[5n+a, 5n+b+1]$	$[11n-b, 11n-a+1]$
	4			$[n+a+2, n+b+1]$	$[3n-b+1, 3n-a+1]$	$[5n+a+1, 5n+b+2]$	$[11n-b+1, 11n-a+2]$
	6				$[3n-b+2, 3n-a+2]$	$[5n+a+2, 5n+b+3]$	$[11n-b+1, 11n-a+3]$
II.	8				$[3n-b+3, 3n-a+2]$	$[5n+a+3, 5n+b+3]$	$[11n-b+2, 11n-a+3]$
	10					$[5n+a+3, 5n+b+4]$	$[11n-b+2, 11n-a+4]$
	12					$[5n+a+4, 5n+b+4]$	$[11n-b+3, 11n-a+4]$
	14					$[5n+a+5, 5n+b+5]$	$[11n-b+4, 11n-a+5]$
	16					$[5n+a+6, 5n+b+5]$	$[11n-b+5, 11n-a+5]$
	18						$[11n-b+5, 11n-a+6]$
	0		$[n-b, n-a]$	$[n+a, n+b]$	$[3n-b, 3n-a]$	$[5n+a, 5n+b]$	$[11n-b, 11n-a]$
	1	$[a, b]$					
	2	$[a, b+1]$	$[n-b, n-a+1]$	$[n+a, n+b+1]$	$[3n-b, 3n-a+1]$	$[5n+a, 5n+b+1]$	$[11n-b, 11n-a+1]$
	4			$[n+a+1, n+b+2]$	$[3n-b+1, 3n-a+2]$	$[5n+a+1, 5n+b+2]$	$[11n-b+1, 11n-a+2]$
	6				$[3n-b+1, 3n-a+3]$	$[5n+a+1, 5n+b+3]$	$[11n-b+1, 11n-a+3]$
III.	8				$[3n-b+2, 3n-a+3]$	$[5n+a+2, 5n+b+3]$	$[11n-b+2, 11n-a+3]$
	10					$[5n+a+2, 5n+b+4]$	$[11n-b+2, 11n-a+4]$
	12					$[5n+a+3, 5n+b+5]$	$[11n-b+3, 11n-a+5]$
	14					$[5n+a+4, 5n+b+6]$	$[11n-b+4, 11n-a+6]$
	16					$[5n+a+5, 5n+b+6]$	$[11n-b+5, 11n-a+6]$
	18						$[11n-b+5, 11n-a+7]$

Table 4: Values for the proof of Theorem 1.1.

6. We already know that the Relation 5. is true so we subtract it from Relation 6. to get:

$$\mathcal{P}_{16n+7} - \mathcal{P}_{16n+6} = \mathcal{P}_{4n+3} - \mathcal{P}_{4n+2}.$$

Now we follow the usual procedure. The triple is $(0, 0, 0,)$ and we have to split intervals before we can normalize to zero.

7. Straightforward. The triple is $(0, 0, 0,)$ and we can normalize to zero.

8. We subtract Relation 7. from Relation 8. we get $\mathcal{P}_{16n+10} - \mathcal{P}_{16n+8} = 0$. Again the triple is $(0, 0, 0,)$ and we can normalize to zero.

9. If we subtract Relation 8. from Relation 9. we get:

$$\mathcal{P}_{16n+11} - \mathcal{P}_{16n+10} = -\mathcal{P}_{16n+3} + 2\mathcal{P}_{8n+2} - \mathcal{P}_{2n+1}.$$

Our triple is $(-1, -1, -1)$, we have to split and in all three cases we get

$$0 = [\![5n{+}b{+}4 \text{ even}]\!] + [\![5n{+}b{+}1 \text{ even}]\!] - 1$$

as final result.

10. The triple is $(0, -1, 0)$. The rest of the calculation is lengthy, since for the first time all three cases are different, but not too hard. We have to split in the second and third case.

11. Another long calculation. Our triple is $(0, -2, -1)$. We have to split in the second and third case. We show as an example the fourth step in the second case:

$$\begin{aligned}
0 = &-2\overbrace{\#_2[3n{-}b{+}2, 3n{-}a{+}2]}^{8n+7} + 2\overbrace{\#_2[n{-}b, n{-}a]}^{2n+1} \\
&+3\overbrace{\#_2[3n{-}b{+}2, 3n{-}a{+}1]}^{8n+6} - 3\overbrace{\#_2[n{+}a{+}1, n{+}b]}^{4n+2} \\
&+2\overbrace{\#_2[3n{-}b, 3n{-}a{+}1]}^{8n+3} - 3\overbrace{\#_2[n{+}a{+}1, n{+}b]}^{4n+2} + \overbrace{\#_2[5n{+}a{+}5, 5n{+}b{+}5]}^{16n+15} \\
&+\overbrace{\#_2[n{-}b, n{-}a]}^{2n+1} - \overbrace{\#_2[5n{+}a, 5n{+}b{+}1]}^{16n+3} - 2
\end{aligned}$$

The first two lines cancels and we can start to split intervals.

$$\begin{aligned}
0 = &\#_2[5n{+}a{+}5, 5n{+}b{+}5] - \#_2[5n{+}a{+}1, 5n{+}b{+}1] - [\![5n{+}a \text{ even}]\!] \\
&+ \#_2[n{-}b, n{-}a{-}1] + [\![n{-}a \text{ even}]\!] - \#_2[n{+}a{+}1, n{+}b] \\
&+ 2\#_2[3n{-}b, 3n{-}a{+}1] - 2\#_2[n{+}a{+}1; n{+}b] - 2
\end{aligned}$$

The first two lines cancel and after splitting the first interval in the last line two times we get the true equation

$$0 = +2[\![3n{-}a{+}1 \text{ even}]\!] + 2[\![3n{-}a \text{ even}]\!] - 2.$$

12. Straightforward. The triple is $(0, 0, 0)$ and we can normalize to zero.

13. We subtract Relation 6. from Relation 13. to get

$$\mathcal{P}_{32n+19} - \mathcal{P}_{16n+7} = 0.$$

The triple is $(0, 0, 0)$. We normalize to zero.

□

7 Properties of $\mathcal{P}_n$

In this section we show three additional properties of $\mathcal{P}_n$. In the first lemma we show that $\mathcal{P}_n$ changes in steps of 2 (for $n > 0$).

Lemma 7.1. *For $n \geq 4$ we have*

$$\mathcal{P}_{n+1} - \mathcal{P}_n \in \{-2, 0, 2\}.$$

Proof. Due to Equation (4) we know that there are three possibilities for the relative sizes of $\mathbf{PAIRS}(2n-2)$ and $\mathbf{PAIRS}(2n)$:

1. $[a, b]$, $[a+1, b]$
2. $[a, b]$, $[a, b+1]$
3. $[a, b]$, $[a+1, b+1]$

We use Lemma 5.4 and with $\mathcal{C} := \#(\mathbf{PAIRS}(2n) \cap \mathbf{PAIRS}(2n-2))$ and $\mathcal{E} := \#_2(\mathbf{PAIRS}(2n) \cap \mathbf{PAIRS}(2n-2))$ we get

Case	$\mathcal{P}_{2n-1}$	$\mathcal{P}_{2n}$	$\mathcal{P}_{2n+1}$
1.	$2(2(\mathcal{C}{+}1){-}\mathcal{E}{-}[\![a \text{ even}]\!])$	$2((\mathcal{C}{+}1){+}\mathcal{C}{-}\mathcal{E})$	$2(2\mathcal{C}{-}\mathcal{E})$
2.	$2(2\mathcal{C}{-}\mathcal{E})$	$2((\mathcal{C}{+}1){+}\mathcal{C}{-}\mathcal{E})$	$2(2(\mathcal{C}{+}1){-}\mathcal{E}{-}[\![b{+}1 \text{ even}]\!])$
3.	$2(2(\mathcal{C}{+}1){-}\mathcal{E}{-}[\![a \text{ even}]\!])$	$2((\mathcal{C}{+}1){+}(\mathcal{C}{+}1){-}\mathcal{E})$	$2(2(\mathcal{C}{+}1){-}\mathcal{E}{-}[\![b{+}1 \text{ even}]\!])$

In all three cases, regardless if a and $b{+}1$ are even or odd, Lemma 7.1 is true. □

Now we want to prove that the sequence $\mathcal{P}_n$ is unbounded.

Lemma 7.2. *If $\mathbf{pairs}(n) = [a, b]$, $\mathbf{pairs}(n+1) = [a, b+1]$ with n and b odd and a even and then the sequence $a_0 = n$, $a_{i+1} = 16a_i - 5$ satisfies*

$$\mathcal{P}_{a_n} = \mathcal{P}_{a_0} + 6n.$$

Proof. If we start with two sets $\mathbf{pairs}(n) = [a, b]$ and $\mathbf{pairs}(n+1) = [a, b+1]$ we can use Theorem 5.2 to get $\mathbf{pairs}(16n-5) = [5n + a - 3, 5n + b - 1]$ and $\mathbf{pairs}(16n-6) = [5n + a - 3, 5n + b]$.

So if we start in case III. with $\mathbf{pairs}(n)$ and $\mathbf{pairs}(n+1)$ we will be again in case III. with $\mathbf{pairs}(16n-5)$ and $\mathbf{pairs}(16n-6)$. Therefore we can concatenate the whole process.

Furthermore, if n and b are odd and a is even then $16n-5$ and $5n+b-1$ are odd and $5n+a-3$ is even. Hence the sets $\#\mathbf{pairs}(n) = \#[a, b]$ and $\#\mathbf{pairs}(16n-5) = \#[a', b']$ contain an even number of elements and we have:

$$\#[a, b] = 2s, \;\; \#[a', b'] = 2s + 2, \;\; \#_2[a, b] = s, \;\; \#_2[a', b'] = s + 1.$$

Since the values n and $16n-5$ are both odd we know from Theorem 5.2 that $\mathbf{PAIRS}(n-1) = \mathbf{pairs}(n)$ and $\mathbf{PAIRS}(16n-6) = \mathbf{pairs}(16n-5)$. Now we apply Lemma 5.4 and get $\mathcal{P}_n = 6s$ and $\mathcal{P}_{16n-5} = 6s + 6$. □

The sequence $\mathcal{P}_3 = 6, \mathcal{P}_{43} = 12, \mathcal{P}_{683} = 18, \ldots$ is one example of such an unbounded sequence. In [8] they show $\mathcal{P}_t^{(2)}((2 \cdot 4^m + 4)/3) = \Theta(m)$ which also proves that the sequence $\mathcal{P}_n$ is unbounded.

The last theorem reveals the symmetries of $\mathcal{P}_n$.

Case	i	$\mathbf{pairs}(n{+}i)$		$\mathbf{pairs}(2n{+}i)$	$\#\mathbf{pairs}(n{+}i)$		$\#\mathbf{pairs}(2n{+}i)$
	-1			$[a'{+}1\,,b']$			$\mathcal{C}$
I.	0	$[a\,,b]$	$\longmapsto$	$[a'{+}1\,,b'{+}1]$	$\mathcal{C}$	$\longmapsto$	$\mathcal{C}+1$
	$+1$	$[a\,,b]$		$[a'\,,b'{+}1]$	$\mathcal{C}$		$\mathcal{C}$
	-1			$[a'{+}1\,,b']$			$\mathcal{C}+1$
II.	0	$[a{+}1\,,b]$	$\longmapsto$	$[a'{+}1\,,b']$	$\mathcal{C}+1$	$\longmapsto$	$\mathcal{C}+1$
	$+1$	$[a\,,b]$		$[a'\,,b']$	$\mathcal{C}$		$\mathcal{C}$
	-1			$[a'\,,b']$			$\mathcal{C}$
III.	0	$[a\,,b]$	$\longmapsto$	$[a'\,,b'{+}1]$	$\mathcal{C}$	$\longmapsto$	$\mathcal{C}+1$
	$+1$	$[a\,,b{+}1]$		$[a'\,,b'{+}1]$	$\mathcal{C}+1$		$\mathcal{C}+1$

Table 5: The action of Theorem 5.2 on $\mathbf{pairs}(n)$ and $\mathbf{pairs}(n+1)$

Theorem 7.3. *The 2-abelian complexity of the Thue–Morse word is a concatenation of palindromes of increasing size since the sequence*

$$\mathcal{P}_{2^q+1}\mathcal{P}_{2^q+2}\mathcal{P}_{2^q+3}\cdots\mathcal{P}_{2^{q+1}+1}$$

is a palindrome, or equivalently

$$\mathcal{P}_{2^q+1+i} = \mathcal{P}_{2^{q+1}+1-i}$$

for $0 \le i \le 2^{q-1}$.

Proof. First we will show by induction that the sequence

$$\#\mathbf{pairs}(2^q+1), \#\mathbf{pairs}(2^q+2), \ldots, \#\mathbf{pairs}(2^{q+1}+1)$$

is a palindrome. The base case is

$$\#\mathbf{pairs}(3) = 2, \#\mathbf{pairs}(4) = 3, \#\mathbf{pairs}(5) = 2.$$

Two sets $\mathbf{pairs}(2^q+1+i)$ and $\mathbf{pairs}(2^{q+1}+1-i)$ with $0 \le i \le 2^{q-1}$ are called *corresponding sets*. If a consecutive pair of sets is mapped to a consecutive triple of sets

$$\begin{array}{rl} & \mathbf{pairs}(2^{q+1}+2i-1) \\ \mathbf{pairs}(2^q+i\quad) \mapsto & \mathbf{pairs}(2^{q+1}+2i\quad) \\ \mathbf{pairs}(2^q+i+1) & \mathbf{pairs}(2^{q+1}+2i+1) \end{array}$$

with $1 \le i \le 3\cdot 2^{q-1}$ then the corresponding pair of consecutive sets is mapped to a consecutive triple of sets

$$\begin{array}{rl} & \mathbf{pairs}(2^{q+2}-2i+1) \\ \mathbf{pairs}(2^{q+1}-i+1) \mapsto & \mathbf{pairs}(2^{q+2}-2i+2). \\ \mathbf{pairs}(2^{q+1}-i+2) & \mathbf{pairs}(2^{q+2}-2i+3) \end{array}$$

Now we look at Table 5 and see that it is enough to know the relative sizes of consecutive pairs of sets do determine in which case we are. So if a consecutive pair of sets is mapped to a consecutive triple of sets via case II. the corresponding consecutive pair of sets is mapped to a corresponding consecutive triple of sets via case III. and vise versa. If we have a case I. map for the consecutive pair of sets we also have a case I. map for the corresponding consecutive pair of sets. In all three cases the palindromic structure of the set cardinality is preserved.

Now we show that

$$\#_2\mathbf{pairs}(2^q+1), \#_2\mathbf{pairs}(2^q+2), \ldots, \#_2\mathbf{pairs}(2^{q+1}+1)$$

is a palindrome too. We do this by showing that for two corresponding sets $\mathbf{pairs}(2^q+1+i) = [a,b]$ and $\mathbf{pairs}(2^{q+1}+1-i) = [a',b']$ we have

$$a \equiv b' \pmod 2 \text{ and } a' \equiv b \pmod 2. \tag{5}$$

Since two corresponding sets have the same cardinality we can conclude that $\#_2[a,b] = \#_2[a',b']$.

Since $\mathcal{P}_3 = 6$, Relation 1. tells us $\mathcal{P}_{2^q+1} = 6$, so Equation (5) is true for our base case, the corresponding sets $\mathbf{pairs}(2^q+1)$ and $\mathbf{pairs}(2^{q+1}+1)$.

We use induction to go from $\mathbf{pairs}(2^q+1+i)$ and $\mathbf{pairs}(2^{q+1}+1-i)$ to $\mathbf{pairs}(2^q+1+(i+1))$ and $\mathbf{pairs}(2^{q+1}+1-(i+1))$. We have to check the three cases from Table 5 again:

In the first case nothing changes, we go from $[a,b]$ and $[a',b']$ to $[a,b]$ and $[a',b']$ and Equation 5 is trivially fulfilled.

In the second case we go from $[a,b]$ and $[a',b']$ to $[a+1,b]$ and $[a',b'-1]$ and Equation 5 is fulfilled again.

In the third case the step is from $[a,b]$ and $[a',b']$ to $[a,b+1]$ and $[a'-1;b']$ and Equation 5 holds.

Since

$$\#\mathbf{pairs}(2^q+1+i) = \#\mathbf{pairs}(2^{q+1}+1-i)$$

and also

$$\#_2\mathbf{pairs}(2^q+1+i) = \#_2\mathbf{pairs}(2^{q+1}+1-i)$$

with $0 \le i \le 2^{q-1}$ we can use Theorem 5.2 and to get

$$\#\mathbf{PAIRS}(2^q+2i) = \#\mathbf{PAIRS}(2^{q+1}-2i)$$

and also

$$\#_2\mathbf{PAIRS}(2^q+2i) = \#_2\mathbf{PAIRS}(2^{q+1}-2i)$$

with $0 \le i \le 2^{q-2}$. Now we use Lemma 5.4 and get $\mathcal{P}_{2^q+1+i} = \mathcal{P}_{2^{q+1}+1-i}$ with $0 \le i \le 2^{q-1}$. □

Acknowledgements

The author is supported by the Austrian Science Fund FWF projects W1230, Doctoral Program "Discrete Mathematics", and F5503 (part of the special research program (SFB) "Quasi-Monte Carlo Methods: Theory and Applications"). The author is grateful to his advisor Peter Grabner and a anonymous referee whose comments and feedback greatly improved this article.

References

[1] J.-P. Allouche and J. Shallit. The ring of k-regular sequences. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 98(2):163–197, 1992.

[2] J.-P. Allouche and J. Shallit. *Automatic Sequences: Theory, Applications, Generalizations*. Cambridge University Press, 2003.

[3] J.-P. Allouche and J. Shallit. The ring of k-regular sequences, II. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 307(1):3–29, 2003.

[4] S. Brlek. Enumeration of factors in the Thue–Morse word. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 24(13):83 – 96, 1989.

[5] S. Eilenberg. *Automata, languages, and machines.*, volume A. Academic Press, New York and London, 1974.

[6] J. Karhumäki. Generalized Parikh mappings and homomorphisms. In *Automata, languages and programming*, volume 115 of *Lect. Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 324–332. Springer, Berlin-New York, 1981.

[7] J. Karhumäki, A. Saarela, and L. Zamboni. On a generalization of abelian equivalence and complexity of infinite words. *J. Comb. Theory Ser. A*, 120(8):2189–2206, Nov. 2013.

[8] J. Karhumäki, A. Saarela, and L. Zamboni. Variations of the Morse–Hedlund theorem for k-abelian equivalence, 2013.

[9] B. Madill and N. Rampersad. The abelian complexity of the paperfolding word. *Discrete Math.*, 313(7):831 – 838, 2013.

[10] A. Parreau, M. Rigo, E. Rowland, and E. Vandomme. A new approach to the 2-regularity of the ℓ-abelian complexity of 2-automatic sequences. *Electr. J. Comb.*, 22(1):1–27, 2015.

[11] A. Parreau, M. Rigo, and E. Vandomme. A conjecture on the 2-abelian compelexity of the Thue–Morse word, 2014.